



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

intensively the period between 1559 and 1576—the epoch treated in the present work—and I cannot read history as it is read here. It is a failing of Catholic historical writers in general, that they interpret the Reformation period exclusively in terms of religion. Modern scientific investigation has disproved this, and social, economic, and other causes must be given due weight. Religion is not the only touchstone to test the era by. Examples of this all-inclusive, or all-exclusive interpretation in the present work are many and various. The Edict of January 17, 1562, was not an act of “blind toleration” (p. 265). The estimate of the character of the chancellor L’Hôpital (pp. 267–68 and *passim*) is an ultra-Catholic one and does not agree with modern historical appreciation. Readers of the account on p. 630 which details the efforts of the Jesuit Possevin “pour sauver, au moins de la mort éternelle,” the 200 Huguenots of Roanne imprisoned after the Massacre of St. Bartholomew may have an ironical view of the clemency here so lauded. For “ces malheureux . . . se montrèrent sourds à sa voix. Peu de temps après ils étaient tous massacrés.” Quite as remarkable an example, however, of this partisan interpretation of history is the character-sketch of the cardinal of Lorraine (pp. 643–44). It is with some astonishment that one reads, even from the pen of a Jesuit, that the cardinal “se montra digne du pouvoir par l’étendue de sa prévoyance, la pureté de ses sentiments et l’énergie de son caractère.” But why continue? The present work may be the authoritative history of the Jesuits in France in that it bears the official *imprimatur* of the order. But tried at the bar of scientific, non-partisan, historical writing, which aims to discover the truth without fear and without reproach, the work cannot be regarded as authoritative. Better far should the truth-seeker read the admirable historical introduction which M. Gabriel Monod has lately written as a foreword to Professor Boehmer’s history of the Jesuits (Boehmer, *Les Jésuits*; avec une introduction historique, par Gabriel Monod, pp. lxxxiii+304. Paris: Armand Colin et Cie, 1910).

JAMES WESTFALL THOMPSON

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE ENGLISH CHURCH UNDER JAMES I¹

The reconstruction of the English church, which was the consummation of a long historical process, took place in the early years of James I. The leading spirit was Bishop, afterward Archbishop, Bancroft.

¹ *The Reconstruction of the English Church.* By Roland G. Usher. Vols. I and II. New York and London: Appleton & Co., 1910. 423 and 426 pages. \$6.

In order that the reconstruction may be adequately understood several matters—psychological and historical—must be firmly grasped and as firmly held from the beginning to the end of the process. The psychological matter is the limitation of the mind which causes it to take an inadequate view of things—a view that may contain much of truth, but which is nevertheless fatally inadequate—and hold it to the bitter end, or until through violent collision it is knocked open and made hospitable to new truth. Historically we see a concrete working-out of this limitation—on the secular side in politics and economics, on the ecclesiastical side in Catholicism, Anglicanism, and Puritanism—and throughout the process the interplay of the secular and the ecclesiastical forces.

It is evident, then, that before the subject can be adequately treated there must be several preliminary essays in which conceptions of church and state, the nature and purpose of Anglicanism, the nature and purpose of Puritanism, the real character of the High Commission, a bishop's functions as an officer of state, constitutional problems, condition of the clergy, the attitude of the people toward the church, and a full statement of the problem shall be fully discussed. These preliminary matters occupy all of Book I, and cover 281 pages.

The English church broke entirely with Romanism under the Tudors, and started on its own definite line of development. Henry VIII repudiated Romanism. Its authority over the English church was a usurpation in the earlier centuries, and it had been exercised with more or less effectiveness until this reign. A very decided advance in polity and doctrine was taken under Edward VI in the Prayer Books and the Forty-two Articles. Under Elizabeth still further steps were taken toward unity—but there was no perfect organization—and in the last analysis everything was vague and indefinite. Indeed Elizabeth in her difficult position

must make the definitions of her new church as vague as possible in order to enrol under its banner every subject who could bring himself to abjure the allegiance to Rome. . . . She wished the details to remain in doubt, not, however, because she had any intention of allowing the divines to decide them, but because she was by no means sure what the great bulk of the nobles, of the gentry, and of the common people would approve. They must not be offended and they must accept the new church [I, 201].

Nevertheless in Elizabeth's reign the episcopal form of church government was firmly established as the polity of the English church and by this polity she prepared to stand. She believed in reformation, but

reformation had now gone quite far enough. To go farther was to squint at anarchy. Therefore in some way or other she prepared to arrest further advance, and to have all her subjects conform.

But Puritanism arose in this same reign and began to assert itself very insistently through letters coming up from many directions, and with complete unanimity complaining of oppression and of serious interference with rights. At first all this was perplexing, and the authorities did not know what to do about it. But at last Puritanism was "unmasked." It was discovered that there was a deliberate and deeply laid plan to abolish episcopacy and set presbytery up in its stead. Thus was revealed a radical issue and around this issue the battle was to rage. Moreover, it gradually developed that not only in polity, but also in doctrine, were the differences between Anglicanism and Puritanism so divergent that there was no possibility that they should ever be compromised.

But at the accession of James I we reach the stage of final, and unequivocal, and discriminating decision. The time has come for reconstruction, and this is the subject of Book II. The succession has been made secure by the union of the crowns of Scotland and England; Protestantism has been safely established; and it remains to adjust the relations of Catholicism and Puritanism to Anglicanism. This problem is to be intrusted to the decision of ecclesiastics—and its solution is the reconstruction of the English church.

In 1604 the welfare of the English Church demanded, both for the present and the future, three things: the codification of the Canons, Articles, and Ordinances then in force; the provision of adequate ecclesiastical incomes; and the enforcing of conformity. The first would answer the swelling murmur among the Puritans that "it is now high time for them to declare to the world by what authoritie they doe these thinges and no longer to hold us in suspense with generall termes of justification." The second would remedy pluralities and non-residence, and make possible a learned clergy so far as so deepseated an evil could be reached by any single reform at one time. The last would once more restore the vigour of the old administrative fabric and render the work of maintaining peace and order less difficult in the future. In this golden year, 1604, the English church, as Englishmen now know it, came into definite being [I, 334].

With this threefold purpose clearly in mind James and Bancroft resolutely set themselves to its attainment. Their work culminated in tracing the growth of the written constitution into the Canons of 1604, and the shaping of the Visitation Articles of 1605. It remained to carry out the provisions.

The Puritans, of whom Dr. Usher thinks the comparative number was really very small, had done everything in their power to prevent the passage of the Code of Canons. Yet they were passed, confirmed by the Crown as the binding law of the church, and proclaimed on July 16.

The issue is now squarely joined. The Puritans must take one of two alternatives. They must conform or be deprived. Bancroft had foreseen the crisis. As far as possible he had sought to relieve it of its harshness. He would have been glad to wink at mild non-conformity, indeed he sometimes did. With a little stretch of the Puritan conscience coupled with a little shrewd diplomacy nearly if not quite all might have escaped deprivation. As was understood among the few rulers ecclesiastical and temporal in the mediaeval system: "A man might *think* all he pleased but let him not *talk* about his thinking." But the Puritans could not stretch their consciences, neither could they be wisely diplomatic. The result was that most of them remained "obstinate," and consequently suffered all the terrible consequences of deprivation.

With much learning and admirable technique Dr. Usher has in the second book set the whole subject before us, closing with two chapters on: "Justice Tempered with Mercy," and "Administrative Reconstruction."

The third book is devoted to a vindication of Reconstruction, and is written on the same high plane of scholarship and skill.

Considered as a whole, the work is one of exceedingly minute, painstaking, patient research. Every student of the period, whatever his political, economic, or ecclesiastical point of view, will at once see the necessity of giving it careful and prolonged attention. In his preface the author says:

I have tried in these pages to tell nothing but the truth, with an impartiality which should scorn to serve the interests of a sect or pander to the maintenance of a cherished tradition. I have, of course, aimed at entire accuracy of reference, citation, and statement.

We believe that he is entirely sincere. In his altogether admirable first chapter on "The Problem of Reconstruction" he takes account of all the elements in the problem. He recognizes fully the conscience controlling all parties and the inevitable "clash of two irreconcilable ideas." But as he warms up to his subject any lingering trace of sympathy for the Puritans vanishes, and James and Bancroft are carefully justified. But this only shows once more how difficult, perhaps we

should say how impossible, it is for any of us entirely to eliminate the personal equation.

At the conclusion of an inadequate review of a valuable work we venture to make three observations: (1) Among Dr. Usher's sources are many new ones and he has used them for the first time. Naturally these sources will be rigidly scrutinized by all who may not at first accept the conclusions drawn from them. But we are sure that Dr. Usher will warmly welcome such scrutiny. (2) We believe that the day of enforced conformity even in the slightest particular has passed forever. Indeed it looks as if disestablishment were written in the stars. Most interesting is Lecture 8 in the last Bampton Lectures by Canon Hobhouse. On pp. 326 ff. he says: "Disestablishment is bound up with disendowment." The time is now at hand when Christians can only claim liberty—liberty to believe, liberty to teach, and liberty to pay the bills. This puts a fearful responsibility upon the Christian family—the Christian church—and all the agencies for Christian promotion. (3) The Puritans with all their shortcomings are the fore-runners and the English promoters of the course of events that has at last led to the situation in which we find ourselves today.

J. W. MONCRIEF

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE CHURCH IN THEORY AND IN FACT

Canon Hobhouse's lectures¹ present a series of studies showing the relations of the church and the world from New Testament times to the present. The complexity and incongruity of these relations increase until the period of the Reformation. Since the Reformation the perennial problem has been to rectify the mistakes of the earlier times, and to make adjustments suitable to the ever-changing order of the modern world.

Beginning with the gospel records we should first of all learn from them precisely what were the fundamental teachings of the Master.

Two principles [says Canon Hobhouse] may at once be stated as clearly demonstrated if the gospel records are worthy of credit: I. Christ intended to found a visible divine society upon earth to perpetuate his work; and his intention was primary, not subsidiary; II. This divine society he represented as being separate from, and in some sense antagonistic to, the world; and membership in it must involve sacrifice.

¹ *The Church and the World in Idea and in History.* By Walter Hobhouse. New York and London: Macmillan, 1910. xxiv+411 pages. \$3.25.